

REPORT OF SELF-STUDY

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL  
DUKE UNIVERSITY

DECEMBER, 1983

Archives  
207.756  
C187  
R425  
1983

DUKE  
UNIVERSITY



LIBRARY

REPORT OF SELF-STUDY

The Divinity School  
Duke University

Dennis M. Campbell  
Dean of the Divinity School

December, 1983



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/reportofselfstud00camp>

REPORT OF SELF-STUDY

The Divinity School  
Duke University

Introduction	
I. Methodology . . . . .	1
II. Governance . . . . .	2
III. Administration . . . . .	6
IV. Finance . . . . .	12
V. Faculty . . . . .	23
VI. Library . . . . .	27
VII. Admissions . . . . .	33
VIII. Curriculum . . . . .	37
IX. Continuing Education . . . . .	45
X. Student Characteristics and Enrollment Trends . . . . .	47
XI. Student Services . . . . .	55
XII. Physical Facilities . . . . .	58
XIII. Alumni . . . . .	60
XIV. Conclusions and Implications . . . . .	65
Appendices:	
The Student Self-Study Report . . . . .	71
Characteristics of the Divinity School Student Body . . . . .	84



## INTRODUCTION

This Self-Study Report comes at an opportune time for the Divinity School of Duke University. Our last Association of Theological Schools Self-Study was completed in 1969. Events in the life of the Divinity School caused delay beyond the normal ten-year expectation. Now we are poised at the beginning of a new period in our history, and this Self-Study serves as a valuable document. It is fully descriptive of our current situation as a School. As such, it offers us an occasion to reflect upon our present state and what our future ought to be. It shows us our strengths and it demonstrates areas of need. It will help us set our priorities and establish our agenda.

This Report is the work of two Deans, the entire faculty, the administrative officers, and representative students.

Special thanks go to Robert L. Wilson who organized much of the material and wrote most of the document.

I trust we will use this Report effectively.

Dennis M. Campbell  
Dean of the Divinity School

December, 1983





I  
METHODOLOGY

There were three major components to the Self-Study. The first was the study done by the faculty. During the academic year 1981-82, the faculty was divided into five study groups. These were:

- (1) Degree programs
- (2) Curriculum
- (3) Faculty
- (4) Student Body
- (5) Governance

Each group made a study of its area of concern and prepared a paper which was circulated among the faculty. The entire faculty met from time to time to review the work done by the subgroups. A day-long faculty retreat at the beginning of the Fall Semester, 1982 was devoted to formulating conclusions for the final report.

The second component was a study made by a student committee which addressed the same issues as the faculty. A report was prepared and circulated to members of the faculty.

The third component was a review of alumni opinions. A questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of 8% of the graduates to secure their evaluation and perception of the Divinity School.

This Report is based on data provided by faculty, students and alumni.



## II

### GOVERNANCE

The Divinity School is one of six graduate professional schools of Duke University (the others are Law, Medicine, Forestry and Environmental Studies, Nursing, and Business). The other constituent schools of the University are Trinity College of Arts and Sciences, the Graduate School and the Engineering School. By history and indenture, Duke University stands within the Christian tradition and the Divinity School is one of the thirteen theological schools of The United Methodist Church.

As one of the University's professional schools, the Divinity School operates under the University Bylaws and is governed by the Board of Trustees which must approve all matters of finance and which, upon recommendation of the President of the University, appoints the Dean. The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the Dean, the Provost, and the President, grants tenured appointments to the faculty and promotions above the rank of assistant professor.

The Provost of the University, through the designation of the President, has direct oversight of the professional schools. The Dean of the Divinity School works closely with the Provost on matters of budget, faculty appointment and promotion, and all matters pertaining to academic program.

The Dean of the Divinity School is the chief executive and academic officer and is responsible to the President and the Board of Trustees for all matters of the Divinity School's institutional well-being. These include: budget and finance; institutional and financial development; academic program; appointment,



promotion, tenure, continuation, and termination of faculty; appointment and supervision of administrative officers; relationship with The United Methodist Church; relationships with other support constituencies; alumni and external affairs; and formal and informal relationships within Duke University.

The Dean is responsible for the official relationship of the Divinity School to the general University. Budget is determined by regular University procedures, faculty appointments and promotions are processed through University committees and officers, and degree programs are approved by the Academic Council of the University. Internal arrangements, as long as they conform to the prescriptions of University regulations and policies, are determined by the Divinity School itself, under the direction of the Dean and by agreed-upon procedures within the School.

The faculty of the Divinity School is organized to carry on its responsibilities for the educational program of the School. The guidelines by which the faculty is currently organized were formulated in 1968 and adopted in January of 1969. The faculty determines admissions policies and procedures, the curriculum, degree requirements, graduation eligibility, and is involved with the Dean in matters concerning appointment, promotion, tenure, continuation and termination of faculty members. (Organizational Structure of the Divinity School, January 28, 1969. See also Chapter II of Duke University Faculty Handbook, pp. II-2 and II-3.)

In preparation of the Self-Study Document, the committees on governance and administrative organization urged modification of the organizational pattern which was adopted in 1969. At a regular meeting of the faculty on May 4, 1983, it was recommended that revision of faculty organization be proposed for faculty action at the beginning of the Fall Semester, 1983. A group of faculty members



are at work on a revision designed to simplify organization according to specific suggestions made by two committees on governance and organization and by the faculty, as a whole, at the 1982 Faculty Retreat.

Recommendations included simplifying structures to reduce the amount of time spent in meetings, the establishment of a curriculum committee, in order that the faculty as a whole could again exercise its proper responsibility for the curriculum, and the establishment of a standing Committee on Faculty Planning and Appointment. The latter proposal was urged with reference to the fact that large vision and careful planning is necessary in coming years when many new faculty will be needed as a result of mandatory retirements.

The Dean's Advisory Council was a group of persons from outside the Divinity School advisory to the Dean on all matters pertaining to the institutional well-being of the School. In the Fall of 1983, the Advisory Council was transformed by Dean Campbell and President Sanford into a Board of Visitors, conforming to the guidelines of the Board of Trustees of Duke University.

The proposed structure of the Board of Visitors follows:

STRUCTURE OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS  
The Divinity School  
Duke University

- (1) Purpose. The Purpose of the Board of Visitors of the Divinity School of Duke University shall be to advise and support the Dean and the Divinity School. This advice will be especially important in relationship to the church, to the University, and to potential supporters of the School. The Board will advise the Dean in matters concerning all aspects of the Divinity School's life.
- (2) From Dean's Advisory Council to Board of Visitors. The Dean's Advisory Council of the Divinity School of Duke University will become a Board of Visitors by action of the Board of Trustees of Duke University. All current members of the Dean's Advisory Council will be invited to become members of the Board of Visitors. Names of current members will be placed on slips of paper and drawn to be assigned to initial classes as called for in the documents of establishment of the Board of Visitors.





- (3) Membership of the Board. The Board of Visitors will include twenty-four persons. In addition, the Dean of the Divinity School shall be a member ex officio. Included in the membership of the Board of Visitors shall be at least one member of the Board of Trustees of Duke University, some alumni of the Divinity School, some lay persons from The United Methodist Church, and at least one faculty member from another theological school.
- (4) Procedures for Appointment. Appointment to the Board of Visitors of the Divinity School will be made by the President of Duke University upon the advice of the Dean of the Divinity School. The Dean of the Divinity School will submit to the President of the University recommended appointees and letters of appointment will be issued by the President.
- (5) Terms of Office. Persons will be appointed to the Board of Visitors for an initial term of three years. It will be possible for a member of the Board to serve for a second three-year term. Normally, persons will be expected to serve for six years. No member of the Board may serve for more than six years without at least one year off the Board.
- (6) Classes. There will be three classes of membership in the Board of Visitors. Each class will include eight members of the Board.
- (7) Meetings. There will be two meetings of the Board of Visitors each year. One meeting will take place in the Fall Semester; one will take place in the Spring Semester.
- (8) Officers. There shall be a Chairman and a Vice Chairman of the Board of Visitors elected annually by the Board. The Dean will designate a member of the staff of the Divinity School to serve as Secretary. The Secretary will not be a member of the Board. The Dean will serve as chairman of a nominating committee of Board members to recommend officers. They shall be elected annually.
- (9) Relationship to the University Board of Trustees and Central University Administration. The Board of Visitors of the Divinity School will annually report to the Committee on Academic Affairs of the Board of Trustees of the University. Occasionally, the Chairman of the Board of Visitors may be invited to report to the Board of Trustees of the Board of the University.



### III ADMINISTRATION

The administrative organization of the Divinity School currently includes nine officers. Their leadership style is characterized by strong commitment to the Divinity School and to close coordination, cooperation, teamwork, and collegiality. The officers, as of September 1, 1983, with the date of their initial appointment, and their primary areas of responsibility, are as follows:

(1) Dean. Dennis M. Campbell, A.B., Duke University; B.D., Yale University; Ph.D., Duke University. Dean of the Divinity School and Professor of Theology. (1979; appointed Dean December 1, 1982).

The Dean is the chief executive, academic, and financial officer. He has general administrative responsibility for all aspects of the Divinity School. With the increasing size of Duke University, and the growing expectation that each constituent school must assume responsibility for its own total life, the deanship has become more complex. While at one time many aspects of the Divinity School's life were cared for by other officers of Duke University, now the Divinity School must care for these needs, and bear the attendant costs. An example of this is alumni affairs; others are development, communications, and personnel records.

The Dean must give general oversight to the entirety of the Divinity School life and program, including faculty development and curriculum, degree programs, continuing education, recruitment and admission of students, financial and institutional development, budget, personnel administration, external



relationships, and community life. The Dean is responsible, along with the chairman of the Department of Religion, for the Graduate Program in Religion. The Dean also has teaching responsibilities.

The Dean must serve four primary constituencies, namely (1) the faculty and students of the Divinity School, (2) the Trustees, administration and faculty of Duke University, (3) alumni and external supporters, including Trustees of The Duke Endowment and the Divinity School Board of Visitors and (4) The United Methodist Church. None of these can be neglected, as this Self-Study makes clear. Effective relationship with all of these groups is vital to the present state and future shape of the Divinity School.

The Dean must be aggressive, sensitive, skilled and tireless in promoting the interests of the Divinity School within the University, the general academic community, the church, and among potential friends.

(2) Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs. Robert L. Wilson, A.B., Asbury College; M.A., Lehigh University; B.D., Garrett Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Northwestern University. Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs and Research Professor of Church and Society. (1970; appointed Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs 1980).

The Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs is responsible for scheduling courses, coordinating faculty offerings, evaluating transcripts, handling student academic problems, monitoring student academic progress, and supervising the operations of the Registry. The Associate Dean serves part-time in this capacity, though demands are great and the requirements of the job exceed part-time status.

(3) Assistant Dean for Field Education and Student Services. B. Maurice Ritchie, A.B., Davidson College; B.D., Duke University; Th.M., Duke University; further graduate study, Duke University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. (1973).



The Assistant Dean for Field Education and Student Services is responsible for all aspects of student affairs. This includes recruitment, admissions, financial aid, and student life. He is also director of the field education program. As such he is an educational officer of the Divinity School since field education is a component of the basic degree programs. The Assistant Dean is responsible for the assignment of students to field placements, supervision of their field experience, and evaluation of their readiness for ministry. The Assistant Dean also consults with judicatory officials in the selection of student pastors and is responsible for their training, supervision and evaluation.

The Assistant Dean works closely with bishops, district superintendents, local church committees, boards of ordained ministry and the Rural Church Division of The Duke Endowment.

(4) Director of Continuing Education. (Currently not filled)

The Director of Continuing Education is responsible for all non-degree educational programs. The Director works closely with the Dean and the Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs and handles many relationships with other schools and programs in the University. The Director works with the church in a consultative role, and with alumni and other persons who seek educational services of the Divinity School. The Director coordinates off-campus educational programs, special institutes, international programs, and Convocation. A great deal of the Director's time is spent in the development of educational programs and in relationship of the Divinity School to external constituencies.

(5) Director of Admissions and Student Affairs. Paula Elizabeth Gilbert, B.A., Huntingdon College; M.Div., Duke University. (1980).

The Director of Admissions and Student Affairs is responsible for recruitment and admission of students. The Director coordinates all recruitment





activities and the work of the Admissions Committee. The Director also works with student financial aid. The Director is a major interpreter of the life and work of the Divinity School to prospective students, the church constituency, to alumni and to supporters. The Director also is responsible for student life activities. The Director counsels students, works with student organizations, and provides guidance for student concerns.

(6) Director of Development and Alumni Affairs. Wesley F. Brown, B.A., Methodist College; M.Div., Duke University. (1981).

The Director of Development and Alumni Affairs works closely with the Dean in the management of the Annual Fund, alumni activities, capital gifts, corporate gifts, major gift prospects, telethon, foundation proposals, and relationships with local churches and general church agencies. The Director assists with communications, external affairs, and long-range planning. The Director relates to the Board of Visitors, the Alumni Council, the Dean's Club, and other institutional support groups. The Director is the Divinity School's liaison officer with the University Office of Development and Office of Alumni Affairs.

(7) Administrative Assistant for General Administration and Finance. Clara S. Godwin. (1969).

The Administrative Assistant for General Administration and Finance works closely with, and reports directly to, the Dean. The responsibilities of this position are varied and include the following: business management of the Divinity School budget; supervision of support staff (interviewing, hiring and evaluation), including student employees; service on the Financial Aid Committee; supervision of maintenance and of physical facilities; purchase of supplies and



equipment; allocation of space usage; planning and coordination of official social functions; public relations representative for the Dean's Office.

(8) Director of Black Church Affairs. Grant S. Shockley, A.B., Lincoln University; M.Div., Drew University; M.A., Columbia University; Ed.D., Columbia University. Director of Black Church Affairs and Professor of Christian Education. (1983).

The Director of Black Church Affairs is responsible for all aspects of the Divinity School's work with the black church. This includes recruitment and admission of students, counseling of students, work with alumni, continuing education for ethnic minority pastors, and relationships with black church leaders and constituencies. The Director is a full member of the faculty of the Divinity School and provides leadership for the general concerns of black church studies.

(9) Director of Communications. Christopher Walters-Bugbee, B.A., Hamilton College; graduate theological study at the Episcopal Divinity School, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary and Harvard Divinity School. (1983).

The Director of Communications prepares brochures and interpretive materials for all Divinity School programs and offices. The Director writes and edits Divinity School publications, including an alumni newsletter, bulletin, catalog, and other appropriate organs. The Director is responsible for all aspects of preparation, production and mailing of materials. The Director works with the church and secular press to communicate the story of Duke Divinity School. Press releases, the generation of publicity, and external perception of the Divinity School are the Director's responsibility.

All administrative officers are responsible to the Dean. The demands of the deanship have caused some concern about the present administrative



organization. As currently structured, the Dean is called upon to give direct leadership to a large staff and many programs. The requirement that the University professional schools provide their own services (alumni affairs, development, communications, personnel) has multiplied the Dean's managerial responsibilities.



IV  
FINANCE

In the 1983-84 fiscal year, the Divinity School will operate on a budget of \$4.2 million.

Income

Analysis of sources of projected income results in the following picture:

Table 1  
Sources of Projected Income  
1983 - 1984

Student Tuition and Fees	24%
Endowment Income	22%
United Methodist Church Ministerial Education Fund	20%
Gifts and Grants	17%
Field Education Grants	15%
Annual Fund	1%
Churches and Organizations	1%
	<hr/> 100%

Although the budget of the Divinity School increases each year, over the past five years these percentages have remained essentially the same. Each deserves some comment and explanation:

(1) Student Tuition and Fees. No tuition charge was made of Divinity School students until the fiscal year 1964. Since that time tuition charges have been levied; but these charges are considerably less than any of the other professional schools of the University and about half undergraduate tuition





charges. Our 1983-84 academic year tuition is \$3,820.

Table 2

1983-84 Tuitions for other Schools of Duke University\*

Trinity College	\$ 6,780
Fuqua School of Business	8,500
School of Law	8,000
School of Medicine	8,500
Divinity School	3,820

\*Tuition only, does not include fees, housing, food, etc.

Table 3

1983-84 Academic Year Tuition  
at some selected Theological Schools

Duke Divinity School	\$ 3,820
Emory (Candler School of Theology)	4,230
Southern Methodist University (Perkins School of Theology)	4,000
Princeton Theological Seminary	2,500
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary	500 (Baptists) 1,000 (Non-Baptists)
Vanderbilt Divinity School	4,968
Wesley Theological Seminary	3,450
Yale Divinity School	6,300

The Student Tuition category includes subsidy from The United Methodist Church Ministerial Education Fund since most of our United Methodist students receive grants directly from their annual conferences out of a portion of the M.E.F. retained in the annual conference for support of its own students.

Few of our students pay their full tuition and fees from their own sources.

Student tuition and fees provide about 24% of the Divinity School's



total income. This percentage is not excessive. The Divinity School is not unduly dependent on tuition. Nevertheless, tuition is important, and our full-time equivalent enrollment figure cannot be allowed to decline. Moreover, a number of our other sources of income are determined, in part, by the number of students in the School.

(2) Endowment Income. The endowment figure (22% of our annual budget) includes income from a number of funds. The Divinity School, as one of the constituent schools of Duke University, receives a portion of the income from the University's endowment pool. This does not include any of the money received from The Duke Endowment, a separate private trust.

The Divinity School has a number of endowed funds of its own, as well. These endowed funds are part of the University's permanent or quasi-endowment pool, but are specified for the Divinity School. These include scholarship funds, endowed professorship funds, and certain other funds with stipulated purposes. As of June 1982, the market value of all Divinity School endowments, including annuity trust and unitrust funds totaled \$4,533,622.

The Divinity School does not have sufficient endowment. We have no fully-funded professorships, for instance (a fully-funded professorship is \$750,000). We need more endowed scholarships, and we must have more endowment for general operations and undesignated needs. A major continuing development goal is to increase endowment.

(3) United Methodist Church Ministerial Education Fund. The M.E.F. was established by The United Methodist Church in 1970. Former Duke Dean Robert E. Cushman was a leader in the establishment of this Fund. The Fund supports the thirteen United Methodist theological schools. The M.E.F. amounts to



approximately 20% of Duke's annual income. We receive a share of the total annual income of the M.E.F. The distribution of the Fund is determined by a complex formula, including M.Div. enrollment, U.M. enrollment, and various "quality" factors.

In 1982 the M.E.F. distributed \$8,601,450 among the thirteen United Methodist seminaries. Duke received \$751,325.75 (8.73% of the total). The M.E.F. works on a calendar fiscal year, while Duke works on a fiscal year running July 1-June 30. In our 1982-83 fiscal year budget the M.E.F. amounted to \$800,027.04.

The M.E.F. income is accounted for by the University as "Private Gift, Grant and Contract Income." Each month a report is sent to the deans indicating "Private Gift, Grant and Contract Income" for each school in Duke University. Because of the M.E.F., the Divinity School usually ranks third in the University, after the Medical School and Trinity College. The M.E.F. thus greatly enhances our strength in the University because we have strong and stable external support.

The importance of the Ministerial Education Fund cannot be over-emphasized. The Dean must work tirelessly, along with the chief executive officers of the other United Methodist seminaries, and executives of the Board of Higher Education and Ministry, to assure the continuation of the Fund and to work toward increasing levels of support.

(5) Gifts and Grants. Gift and grant income amounts to 17% of our annual budget. This includes gifts from individuals, usually lay persons deeply committed to the church and its ministry, churches, and some foundation grants. The Duke Endowment makes a number of major grants each year to the Divinity School apart from the field education program. This includes regular grants



for continuing education, educational and service projects, and occasional special gifts.

Table 4

Direct Support to the Divinity School  
from The Duke Endowment\*

1982 - 1983

Continuing Education Support (includes gifts and grants)	\$ 78,149
Field Education Program	25,000
Field Education Grants (includes interns and student pastors)	339,885
Field Education Counseling Fund (for supervisory purposes)	8,000
McCormack Fund Memorial Gift	50,000
	\$501,034**

\*The Duke Endowment is a perpetual trust, established by the late James Buchanan Duke by Indenture dated December 11, 1924. The Duke Endowment is entirely separate from Duke University.

\*\*This figure is mainly (though not entirely) support directly to the Divinity School through the Rural Church Division (restricted, by Indenture, to service of The United Methodist Church). It does not include the Divinity School's portion of income to Duke University designated in Mr. Duke's Indenture.

Analysis of gift and grant income demonstrates the importance of The Duke Endowment and of the Divinity School's traditional ties and church constituency. This category of support must be increased.

(6) Field Education Grants. Field Education Grants represent almost 15% of our income. Primarily this money comes from The Duke Endowment through the Rural Church Division. There are a few non-Duke Endowment-eligible churches who make grants.





The Divinity School is blessed with an unequalled field education program because of the support of The Duke Endowment. The money not only makes possible an outstanding program, but also frees the Divinity School from seeking this money from other sources. Also, this money allows our students (not only United Methodists) to help finance their education.

(7) Annual Fund. The Annual Fund figure is an actual figure in the Divinity School budget established in consultation with the University Office of Development and the Provost's Office. We must raise the money one way or another.

In the last year, the Annual Fund has made dramatic progress. Better organization, the cultivation of class agents, and sensitive work with the telethon has greatly increased alumni giving. The Divinity School leads Duke University in the percentage of alumni (more than 50% during fiscal 1982-83) who contribute to the Annual Fund. There are 201 alumni who are members of the Dean's Club (gifts of \$100 or more per year.)

(8) Churches and Organizations. Some churches and organizations make contributions to the Divinity School.

In summary, the Divinity School's income figures demonstrate our dependence on student tuition, on The United Methodist Church, The Duke Endowment, and gifts from individuals who have interest in theological education for service to the church.

A clear priority is increased support from individual donors, and some development of private foundation gifts. Diversification of support is a goal which must be high among our priorities, though evidence suggests that our constituency is fairly well-defined.



Expenditures

Analysis of projected expenditures results in the following picture:

Table 5  
Projected Expenditures  
1983 - 1984

Instruction	30.35%
General Operations	29.75%
Student Financial Aid	23.14%
Physical Plant	8.56%
Library	<u>8.20%</u>
	100.00%

(1) Instruction. This figure represents salaries of the full-time regular faculty.

Salaries in the Divinity School at Duke are established in relationship to the salaries of all Duke faculties, though a given school's financial strength is a consideration. Duke Divinity School salaries are competitive and it is the commitment of the Dean, the Provost, the President, and the Trustees to provide appropriate compensation for professional services.

Average salaries, in rank, for full-time regular faculty are as follows:

Table 6  
Average Faculty Salaries  
1979 - 1984

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PROFESSOR</u>	<u>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</u>	<u>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR</u>	<u>INSTRUCTOR</u>
1979-80	\$ 29,550	\$ 22,600	\$ 20,000	\$ 18,000
1980-81	32,200	24,800	22,900	20,100
1981-82	35,230	28,270	25,190	22,110
1982-83	39,000	31,300	27,000	20,000
1983-84	41,520	32,950	28,900	20,750



These are base salaries in the Divinity School. Total compensation, including fringe benefits (retirement, life insurance, disability, etc.), adds a hidden 20.7% to each faculty salary. Thus a salary of \$32,950, for instance, yields a total compensation of \$39,770.

Duke Divinity School participates with the other major theological schools in a comparative salary study based at Harvard University. Table 7 provides the most recent information on salaries at major divinity schools. Duke compares favorably and is ranked second in mean salaries adjusted for regional variation in cost of living.



Table 7  
Comparative Salary Data for University Divinity Schools  
1980-1981

School	Unad-justed		BLS Index	Ad-justed		Maximum		Minimum	
	Mean	Rank		Mean	Rank	Unad-justed	Ad-justed	Unad-justed	Ad-justed
<u>Tenured Faculty</u>									
Yale	32,400	(3)	103 <sup>1</sup>	31,456	(3)	52,000	50,485	22,000	21,359
Vanderbilt	27,520	(7)	88*	31,273	(4)	38,128	43,327	20,509	23,306
Emory (Candler)	27,665	(6)	91	30,401	(6)	33,000	36,264	22,500	24,725
SMU (Perkins)	27,810	(5)	89	31,247	(5)	34,347	38,592	21,143	23,756
Union (New York)	27,491	(8)	125	21,193	(8)	31,671	25,337	24,194	19,355
Duke	30,564	(4)	95*	32,173	(2)	42,900	45,157	22,400	23,579
Harvard	34,731	(2)	122	28,123	(7)	49,500	40,574	31,700	25,984
Chicago	35,000	(1)	99	35,354	(1)	45,000	45,455	27,000	27,273
<u>Untenured Faculty</u>									
Yale	23,511	(1)	102	22,657	(4)	28,000	27,451	20,000	19,608
Vanderbilt <sup>2</sup>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Emory (Candler)	23,098	(2)	92	25,107	(1)	28,500	30,978	17,500	19,022
SMU (Perkins)	20,226	(4)	89	22,726	(3)	22,732	25,542	18,816	21,142
Union (New York)	18,121	(6)	116	15,622	(6)	18,381	15,846	17,948	15,472
Duke	22,900	(3)	97*	23,608	(2)	22,900	23,608	22,900	23,608
Harvard	18,800	(5)	119	15,798	(5)	20,000	16,807	17,600	14,790
Chicago <sup>3</sup>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

\*1978 index.

<sup>1</sup>Salaries adjusted to correct for regional variation in the cost of living. Index is based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics budgets for a family of four in selected urban areas. High income budgets are used for tenured faculty. Intermediate income budgets are used for untenured faculty.

<sup>2</sup>Vanderbilt reported no untenured faculty.

<sup>3</sup>Chicago declined to release salary data on untenured faculty.





(2) General Operations. Under the category of General Operations come salaries for administrative officers, clerical staff, student staff, and all expenditures for postage, telephone, and other technical necessities.

(3) Student Financial Aid. One of the largest single expenditures of the Divinity School (23% of the budget) is student financial aid. Financial aid will continue to rise as costs for our students rise. Policies and procedures are described in sections on Admissions and Student Services.

(4) Physical Plant. The Divinity School's physical plant consists of Gray Building (the "Old Building") and the New Building. University policy changed in the late 1960's regarding method of support for physical plant. Buildings which were part of the original University plant are cooperatively funded between the central administration and the constituent schools. New buildings are the sole responsibility of the constituent schools. In our case, we are assessed by the University for Gray Building and we pay the entire costs for the New Building. These costs for both buildings include heat and air-conditioning, water, electricity, housekeeping and all other maintenance costs.

(5) Library. This category of expenditure includes salaries of professional library staff (Librarian and Reference Librarian), of library support staff, and acquisitions. Because of the Divinity School Library's relationship to Perkins Library, many technical service costs are absorbed by the Perkins system. The Divinity School Library thus maximizes Divinity School money for acquisitions (see Self-Study section on Library).

#### Summary

The total program of the Divinity School obviously is dependent on our financial capability. The Divinity School is very fortunate. We are an integral



part of a University which grew out of a church-related college and is related officially to The United Methodist Church. The University is committed to the Divinity School and its well-being. On the other hand, financial pressures in the University make it plain that responsibility for the future of the Divinity School will fall to the Divinity School itself, and thus to its church constituency, especially The United Methodist Church, and to individuals, and some foundations, committed to the church and its ministry.

The resources of our own endowments, of the Ministerial Education Fund, and The Duke Endowment provide a solid base, but they are not adequate for our future. We have received a great inheritance, and with it responsibility and obligation, from our past. Our former deans have worked diligently to expand endowed resources, and to improve or expand the physical facilities. Nevertheless, our financial development activities must increase. The Dean and his staff give a sizeable amount of time and effort to this task.



V

FACULTY

The Divinity School faculty consists of twenty-nine persons. The doctorate is held by twenty-five. Two of those without a doctorate are in the process of completing a dissertation. All members of the faculty hold the M.Div. or equivalent professional degree; all but one are ordained clergy.

The Divinity School Faculty (as of September 1, 1983) with the degrees held by each, with date of initial appointment and with mandatory retirement date are:

Lloyd Richard Bailey, A.B., Duke University; B.D., Duke University; Ph.D., Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion; 1971; Fall 2006.

Waldo Beach, B.A., Wesleyan University; B.D., Yale University; Ph.D., Yale University; 1946; Spring 1986.

Dennis M. Campbell, A.B., Duke University; B.D., Yale University; Ph.D., Duke University; 1979; Fall 2015.

James Michael Efird, A.B., Davidson College; B.D., Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Duke University; 1962; Spring 2002.

Richard L. Eslinger, A.B., University of Maryland; S.T.B., Boston University School of Theology; Ph.D., Boston University; 1983; Spring 2010.

Donn Michael Farris, A.B., Berea College; B.D., Garrett Theological Seminary; M.S. in L.S., Columbia University; 1950; Fall 1991.

Mary McClintock Fulkerson, B.M., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; M.Div., Duke University; 1983; Spring 2020.

Richard Albert Goodling, A.B., Franklin and Marshall College; B.D., Lancaster Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Pennsylvania State University; 1959; Fall 1994.

Robert Clark Gregg, B.A., University of the South; S.T.B., Episcopal Divinity School; Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania; 1974; Spring 2008.



Stuart C. Henry, A.B., Davidson College; B.D., Louisville Presbyterian Seminary; Ph.D., Duke University; 1959; Fall 1984.

Frederick Herzog, B.A., Bonn University; B.D., Basel University; Th.M., Princeton Theological Seminary; Th.D., Princeton Theological Seminary; 1960; Fall 1995.

Osmond Kelly Ingram, A.B., Birmingham-Southern; B.D., Duke University; 1959; Spring 1988.

Creighton Lacy, A.B., Swarthmore College; B.D., Yale University; Ph.D., Yale University; 1953; Spring 1989.

Thomas A. Langford, A.B., Davidson College; B.D., Duke University; Ph.D., Duke University; D.D., Davidson College; 1956; Spring 1999.

Richard Lischer, B.A., Concordia Senior College; M.A., Washington University; M.Div., Concordia Seminary; Ph.D., King's College, University of London; 1979; Fall 2013.

Paul A. Mickey, B.A., Harvard College; B.D., Princeton Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Princeton Theological Seminary; 1970; Spring 2007.

Roland E. Murphy, B.A., Catholic University of America; M.A., Catholic University of America; S.T.D., Catholic University of America; S.S.L., Pontifical Biblical Institute; 1971; Spring 1987.

C. G. Newsome, B.A., Duke University; M.Div., Duke University; Ph.D., Duke University; 1978; Spring 2020.

McMurry S. Richey, A.B., Duke University; B.D., Duke University; Ph.D., Duke University; 1954; Fall 1984.

Charles K. Robinson, B.A., Arizona State University; B.D., Southern Methodist University; Ph.D., Duke University; 1961; Spring 1999.

Grant S. Shockley, A.B., Lincoln University; M.Div., Drew University; M.A., Columbia University; Ed.D., Columbia University; 1983; Fall 1989.

Dwight Moody Smith, Jr., A.B., Davidson College; B.D., Duke University; A.M., Yale University; Ph.D., Yale University; 1965; Fall 2001.

Harmon L. Smith, B.A., Millsaps College; B.D., Duke University; Ph.D., Duke University; 1962; Spring 2000.

David C. Steinmetz, B.A., Wheaton College; B.D., Drew University; Th.D., Harvard University; 1971; Spring 2006.

William C. Turner, Jr., B.S., Duke University; M.Div., Duke University; 1982; Spring 2018.





Geoffrey Wainwright, B.A., University of Cambridge; M.A., University of Cambridge; B.D., University of Cambridge; Dr. Theol., University of Geneva; 1983; Spring 2009.

John H. Westerhoff III, B.S., Ursinus College; M.Div., Harvard University; Ed.D., Teachers College, Columbia University; 1974; Spring 2003.

Robert L. Wilson, A.B., Asbury College; M.A., Lehigh University; B.D., Garrett Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Northwestern University; 1970; Spring 1995.

Franklin W. Young, A.B., Dartmouth College; B.D., Crozer Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Duke University; 1968; Spring 1985.

Faculty members tend to remain at Duke for long periods. Through the academic year ending in the Spring of 1982, the average (mean) length of service was 18.75 years. The twenty-four faculty members had given a total of 450 years of service. Twelve had been at Duke for twenty or more years and nineteen for ten years or longer.

The Divinity School is facing the retirement of some of its most prominent faculty members. Seven persons will retire in this decade and four more by 1995. Thus eleven members of the faculty are scheduled to retire in the next twelve years. Areas covered by faculty due to retire between now and 1990 include American Christianity, Theology and Christian Nurture, New Testament, Christian Ethics, Old Testament, Parish Ministry and World Christianity.

The Divinity School has traditionally had, and continues to have, an ecumenical faculty. The present full-time faculty includes men and women who hold ministerial orders in nine denominations including: United Methodist (14), Episcopal (4), Presbyterian (4), United Church of Christ (2), The British Methodist Church (1), Lutheran (1), Missionary Baptist (1), Roman Catholic (1), United Holy Church of America (1).

Four persons are affiliated with the Divinity School as related faculty members. These include Albert F. Fisher, Director of the Office of Rural



Church Affairs of The Duke Endowment, who is Adjunct Professor of Parish Work, P. Wesley Aitken, John C. Detwiler and Peter G. Keese who are members of the chaplain staff of the Duke University Medical Center, and who serve as Associates in Instruction.

The Divinity School expects the members of the faculty to be competent in three areas: teaching, research and writing, and service to the University and church. Persons being considered for faculty positions are judged as to their potential in these areas. Faculty being considered for tenure or promotion are reviewed regarding their performance in all three areas. While individual skills and interests vary, a significant contribution in all three is expected from each individual.

Duke University encourages its faculty to continue to develop. One method is through a sabbatical policy which every seven years relieves the faculty member of all responsibilities for one semester at full salary or two semesters at one-half salary. The person who elects the one semester sabbatical is relieved of committee responsibilities for the entire academic year. Faculty members are also free from classroom responsibilities during the summer which permits three months for research and writing.



VI  
LIBRARY

Any consideration of the Divinity School Library must initially recognize that it is probably more intimately a part of a major general research library than is any other seminary library in the ATS.

It is physically separate from the general library of the University, the William R. Perkins Library, but it stands next to that library and is internally connected to it. The Divinity School Library determines its own collection development policies, handles its own circulation processes, and provides its own reference service. All of the technical services, however, which are necessary to its operation--from the placing of orders to the cataloging and physical preparation of the books coming to its collection--are carried out by centralized departments in the Perkins Library. Furthermore, all of the microforms, manuscripts, and rare books purchased by the Divinity School Library are housed and serviced by the appropriate departments in the Perkins Library. In addition to using the departments of the Perkins Library just referred to, Divinity School students also use the Reference, Documents, Circulation, Inter-library Loan, Photographic Services, Periodicals and Bibliography Departments in that library.

The Librarian of the Divinity School is a full, voting member of the Divinity School faculty with the rank of Professor. As such, his primary reporting responsibility is to the Dean of the Divinity School. In view, however, of the multitude of services which the Perkins Library performs for



the Divinity School Library, the number of Divinity School students who use the Perkins Library, and the fact that the Divinity School Library provides its services to all members of the University community who need to use its collection, it is appropriate and necessary that the Librarian of the Divinity School maintain a close reporting and cooperative relationship with the Librarian of the University. The Divinity School Librarian also maintains a close working relationship with the Assistant University Librarians for Collection Development, Administrative Services, Technical Services, and Public Services, each of whom is concerned with certain aspects of Divinity School Library operations.

The Divinity School Librarian is responsible on the one hand for maintaining the integrity and individuality of the Divinity School Library within the extensive twelve-unit library system of which it is a part, and on the other hand for functioning in such a way as to make the resources of the other units in the system maximally useful to the Divinity School community and the resources of the Divinity School Library maximally useful to the University community at large.

That the Divinity School Library is "a primary information resource for educational and research programs of the institution" is ensured chiefly by its membership in the research-oriented University Library system in which its position has just been explained, and by the presence of its Librarian who has served in his position for more than thirty-two years and who has supervised the acquisition of more than three-quarters of its 215,000 volume collection.

Stated in its broadest terms, the acquisitions philosophy of the Divinity School Library is to secure in research depth, and in all languages used by its clientele, all significant materials needed to support the curricular offerings of the Divinity School and the Department of Religion at both the undergraduate





and graduate levels, and to support the research programs--current and anticipated--of the faculty of both these divisions and of the doctoral candidates in the field of religion.

Library policy is determined by the Librarian after consultation, as necessary, with the remainder of the library staff, the Dean of the Divinity School, the faculty, and the appropriate members of the administrative staff in the Perkins Library.

As was indicated earlier, the Librarian of the Divinity School is a full, voting member of the Divinity School faculty with the rank of Professor. He participates in faculty meetings and, at the discretion of the Dean, serves on faculty committees. He reports to the assembled faculty on library matters of general interest, but his consultation with the faculty is more likely to be on a one-to-one basis rather than with the entire group.

The William R. Perkins Library--and with it the Divinity School Library--have moved more deliberately into the "communications revolution" than have some libraries. The hope has been that reasonable caution at the outset would allow us to avoid serious miscalculations in the initial moves which might require expensive changes of direction or alterations of policy at a later time. Progress now, however, is strong and steady. All acquisitions records are accessed by computer. The Perkins Library is a member of SOLINET and through this membership is linked to OCLC. It is anticipated that the public catalog will be on-line within the next five years. Plans are underway for the storage of all Duke's acquisitions, holdings, and circulation information in a single unified data base which will, of course, be open to and used by the Divinity School Library. The Divinity School Library, in October 1982, acquired a Vector 4 Microcomputer which makes it possible for the Library to access Duke's Technical Services



Data Base, the OCLC Data Base, and the various commercially available data bases. The Vector 4 also has the capacity for word processing and the storage of programs which may either be purchased or prepared locally for the specific needs of the Divinity School Library.

The determination of the adequacy of the Library's holdings for the support of the programs of the School is an integral part of the collection development program which is the major responsibility of the Librarian. The entire collection is always under study with an eye to keeping its strengths balanced; and its various segments come under repeated scrutiny with an eye to keeping them strong, up to date, and supportive of changing emphases in the curriculum and changing interests among students and faculty. In this continuing study, the Librarian is aided by the Reference Librarian and the Circulation Librarians (who have daily experience with the needs and requests of the library patrons), by one-to-one consultations with faculty and students (particularly students in the doctoral program), and by consultation with the Collection Development staff of the Perkins Library (who manifest a keen interest in how the Divinity School collection supports the University's general collection and how the general collection supports the Divinity School collection).

The Divinity School Library operates almost entirely on the basis of one-to-one consultations between staff members and patrons in the provision of bibliographic instruction, in introducing patrons to the resources of the Library, and in giving instruction in research methods and the use of the Library. Both the Librarian and the Reference Librarian have graduate theological degrees as well as degrees in library administration, both members of the circulation staff hold graduate degrees (one in theology), and the



fifth member of the staff (who is responsible for the maintenance of the public catalog) has her undergraduate degree in philosophy and religion. Consequently, all members of the staff have some degree of competence in aiding patrons in the finding and use of library materials; and all of them generally are available to give reference service as it is needed by library patrons.

### Library Renovations

The Divinity School Library is in need of some physical renovation. In the past year, the Dean and the Librarian, working with the Library Committee and the University Architect's Office, developed plans for major refurbishing and significant improvements in the Library. Funds were secured and contracts are now being finalized for a \$90,000 project to be completed in May, 1984.

The project includes:

- a 3-M Security System
- a custom-designed and custom-built circulation desk with computer facilities for library circulation
- new lighting in the Reference Room and the Periodical Room
- a new ceiling in the Reference Room
- new carpeting throughout the Library Circulation and Card Catalog areas
- painting the entire Library
- a new door for the main entrance to the Library.

The Divinity School Library is now the third largest collection in the Duke University Library system.



Table 8

## Distribution by Libraries of Officially Cataloged Materials

	NET ADDED 1981/82	ADDED 1982/83	WITHDRAWALS AND LOSSES	TRANS- FERS	NET ADDITIONS	TOTAL IN LIB. June 30, 1982	TOTAL IN LIB. June 30, 1983
Biology-Forestry	2,288	3,517	388	-7	3,122	140,352	143,674
Chemistry	1,027	1,398	187	-1	1,210	40,257	41,467
Divinity School	6,869	7,372	203	+378	7,547	214,382	221,929
East Campus	3,424	4,784	1,377	+4	3,411	205,830	209,241
Engineering	2,829	2,981	213	+17*	2,785	69,151	71,936
Mathematics-Physics	1,918	2,670	179	-91	2,400	66,771	69,171
Music	1,339	1,942	358	+16	1,600	53,003	54,603
Pearse Memorial	569	613	216	-16	381	15,175	15,556
Perkins	37,793	45,889	1,543	+7	44,353	1,928,436	1,972,789
Undergraduate	45	341	565	-134	-358	20,973	20,615
SUB TOTAL	58,101	71,507	5,229	+173	66,451	2,754,330	2,820,781
Law Library	9,860	6,464	201	0	6,263	272,689	278,952
Med. Center Lib. <sup>1</sup>	7,101	7,120	215	0	6,905	190,941 <sup>2</sup>	197,846
Fuqua Bus. Lib.	-----	3,307	0	0	3,307	-----	3,307
TOTAL	75,062	88,398	5,645	+173	82,926	3,217,960 <sup>3</sup>	3,300,886

1 Fuqua Business Library added to chart 82/83.

2 Medical Center Library figures revised per memo. 10/1/82

3 Total figures revised because of Medical Center Library revision.

NOTE: Total figure includes 133,548 microforms added prior to 79/80.  
From July 1, 1979 microforms were separated. See page 2.





## VII

### ADMISSIONS

In the Bulletin it is stated that the Divinity School is interested in applicants who are academically capable, who demonstrate vocational clarity and commitment and who give evidence of promise for ministry. A minimum grade point average of 2.65 on a 4.0 scale is required for admission. These criteria are observed with a fair degree of strictness. Although persons tend to be most frequently rejected for academic reasons, the Admissions Committee in recent years has become increasingly sensitive to the matter of vocational clarity and commitment. In becoming more sensitive to these criteria, the School's responsibility to the church is recognized. We are also recognizing that our resources are limited and should be utilized in assisting persons in preparation for ministry. The general attitude at Duke is that a smaller entering class that met fully the criteria for admissions is preferred over a larger one that deviates from these norms.

The Divinity School has drawn students most heavily from the southeastern section of the country, particularly from North Carolina, Virginia, and to a lesser degree, from South Carolina and Tennessee. Over the past few years there has been a significant increase in students from such states as Florida, Indiana and Illinois. The idea that an annual conference should have clergy that represent a diversity of theological backgrounds and training is one which probably encourages some students to look to seminaries located outside their home region. This is probably helping Duke to recruit persons from outside the southeast.



For many years, the majority of the students received their undergraduate education at small church-related colleges. Duke is now beginning to receive an increasing number of applicants whose undergraduate training has been at state-supported institutions. This is probably due to:

- (1) the increasing number of Departments of Religion and Philosophy in state schools;
- (2) the rising cost of education which encourages more students to enroll in the state-supported institutions.

In the current academic year, the students enrolled in the Divinity School hold degrees from 210 different institutions. This would seem to indicate that the number of colleges that can be considered regular "feeder" schools for theological seminaries is decreasing.

The percentage of students who are United Methodists has increased dramatically over the past three or four years. The current student body is more than three-fourths United Methodist, the highest proportion in recent years. This would seem to reflect:

- (1) The influence of the candidacy program which brings the ministerial candidate under the supervision of the annual conference very early. This appears to channel students to schools of their own denomination.
- (2) An increased awareness by United Methodist students that they are expected to attend a United Methodist seminary. The fact that the University Senate has been reviewing non-Methodist seminaries and has refused to approve some for United Methodist students underscores this point.
- (3) The pressure by other denominations, particularly Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians, to channel students to their own seminaries reduces the pool of prospective students for ecumenically-oriented schools such as Duke.
- (4) A widespread general perception of clergy oversupply impresses upon the student the value of attending an institution of his or her denomination in order to facilitate entrance into the job market upon graduation.



### The Admissions Process

Admissions decisions are based upon the reading of application materials by a committee composed of faculty and students. The application materials include the application form itself and the critically important essay on why the individual wishes to enter the ministry, four or five letters of recommendation, and the transcripts of all academic work taken.

Materials for Th.M. applicants and special students differ slightly from this. Th.M. applicants submit transcripts, four letters of recommendation, and either the G.R.E. or M.A.T. test scores. Special students submit transcripts, three letters of recommendation and a statement of purpose.

Each application is read and evaluated by four persons. Two negative votes constitute a rejection. Committee members may vote to accept, to reject, to accept on a limited program basis, or to take to the entire committee for discussion. Decisions by the committee are final.

Applicants are encouraged to visit the campus, particularly those who are within a few hundred miles. Such a visit gives the prospective student an opportunity to assess the School and the student can be interviewed to provide additional data to the Admissions Committee.

### Current Trends

An analysis of the current trends in admissions indicates the following:

- (1) A significant increase in the number of inquiries about admissions.
- (2) A slight increase in the number of applications.
- (3) An increasing number of United Methodists, although a wide range of denominations continue to be represented in the remaining students. The greatest loss seems to be in the other mainline denominations (i.e., Baptist, Presbyterian, Episcopal) which maintain theological schools.



- (4) Greater geographical diversity.
- (5) Higher grade point averages on the undergraduate level. This may, however, indicate grade inflation in colleges.
- (6) An increasing number of undergraduate institutions represented among the student body.
- (7) A slightly increasing number of clergy couples.





## VIII

### CURRICULUM

The present curriculum of the Divinity School is, with some alterations, the so-called "New Curriculum" adopted January 22, 1969. The four aims of the curriculum as stated in the Divinity School Bulletin (page 52) are:

- (1) The Christian Tradition. To acquire a basic understanding of the Biblical, historical and theological heritage.
- (2) Self-Understanding. To progress in personal and professional maturity--personal identity, life style as an instrument of ministry, major drives, handling of conflict, resources, professional competency and so forth. This is to be coupled with a sensitivity to the world in which we minister--its social forces, its power structures, its potential for humanization and dehumanization.
- (3) Thinking Theologically. To have the ability to reflect about major theological and social issues and to define current issues in theological terms and theological issues in contemporary secular terms.
- (4) Ministering-in-Context. To have the ability to conceptualize and participate effectively in some form of contemporary ministry.

The Master of Divinity curriculum requires twenty-four courses and two units of field education. One-third of the twenty-four courses are required. A student may elect two courses outside the Divinity School or the Department of Religion, either in Duke University or at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill. A student may also elect to take one or two courses as directed or independent study.

Course offerings are in four academic divisions: Biblical, Historical,



Theological, and Ministerial. The course offerings are further subdivided into fifteen subdivisions: Old Testament, New Testament, Church History, Historical Theology, American Christianity, History of Religions, Christian Theology, Christian Ethics, Black Church Studies, World Christianity and Ecumenics, Care of the Parish, Christian Education, Pastoral Psychology, Preaching, Worship and Church Music.

A total of 232 different courses are listed in the Divinity School Bulletin. Of this number, forty are advanced courses at the 300 level which are designed primarily for graduate students. Seven courses are offered by the Department of Religion but listed in the Divinity School Bulletin. Nine are basic language courses. The breakdown of courses by division are: Biblical, 62 (26.7%); Historical, 39 (16.8%); Theological, 55 (23.7%); and Ministerial, 76 (32.8%).

An attempt is made to offer those courses not taught annually either every other year or every third year. The goal is to have all courses available to the student during the three years that the individual is enrolled in the Divinity School. While this objective is not completely achieved, students do have the opportunity to take most of the courses designed for the M.Div. and the M.R.E. degree candidates.

New courses tend to arise out of the interaction of the faculty and students in areas of common interest. A proposed course is prepared by the individual faculty member and reviewed by the appropriate division. It is then referred to the Educational Affairs Council. If approved by that group, the course becomes a part of the regular offerings.

The course offerings are consistent with the stated purpose of the Divinity School to provide professional education for ministry for those who seek to serve the church as ordained clergy or in lay professional vocations. In its



curriculum and in its admissions policy, the emphasis is upon education for the professional ordained ministry.

The Admissions Committee, in reviewing applications, tries to be as sensitive as possible to persons whose vocational goals are still uncertain at the time of their application. Indeed, a certain level of indecision and uncertainty is allowed by the committee. It is anticipated that the student comes with some degree of understanding that the Divinity School is about the professional education of persons for the ministry and that such education assumes a commitment to the church and a relationship to a particular denomination.

#### Faculty Advising

The administration of such a curriculum is heavily dependent on the system of advising. Each student is assigned a faculty advisor who will provide counsel in the design of the individual's academic program. The advising system is to a great degree dependent on student initiative. Faculty are available to students but there is no regular and systematic review of the student's progress except as it is done at the initiative of the individual advisor or by the Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs when problems arise.

Students are assigned to specific faculty advisors on the basis of particular interests and denominational affiliation. Some assignments are on a random basis. Students retain the same advisor unless a change is requested or a faculty sabbatical makes a change necessary.

The student must fulfill two sets of requirements. The first is the Divinity School's requirements for graduation about which the faculty advisor can be most helpful. The second is the requirements for ordination set by the student's denomination. The student is responsible for learning about and fulfilling these requirements.



### Advanced Placement

An entering student may receive advanced placement in a core course if he or she has (1) completed at least two courses in the same field, and (2) received a minimum grade of B in each. Advanced placement means that the individual may elect not to take the core course but is required to take an advanced course in the same area. The purpose of advanced placement is to enable the student to move directly into more advanced courses in those areas where he or she is adequately prepared.

Students who might qualify for advanced placement are referred by the Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs to a faculty member in the appropriate field. The faculty member reviews the material covered with the student and makes a recommendation to the Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs as to whether the individual qualifies for advanced standing.

It is rare for a student to receive advanced standing in courses other than Old Testament and New Testament. Probably the largest number qualify in New Testament with a somewhat smaller number qualifying in Old Testament. Seminary-bound undergraduates often take several courses in Biblical Studies and, therefore, are qualified to begin advanced work in seminary.

### Cognate Courses

The academic resources available to the theological student at Duke are extensive. These include not only those courses offered by the Divinity School but also graduate courses offered by the Department of Religion and other departments of the University. The student may take two cognate courses outside the Divinity School and Department of Religion which may apply toward the M.Div. degree.





Very few students avail themselves of the opportunity to enroll in cognate courses. The reason is that the requirements for graduation and ordination which the students must fulfill leave little opportunity for courses outside the Divinity School. The student must complete twenty-four courses for the M.Div. degree. Eight of these are required core courses. In addition, the denominations and/or regional judicatories require specific courses for ordination in such subjects as denominational history, doctrine and polity, preaching, worship, Christian education and pastoral psychology. While the requirements will vary among denominations and even within judicatories of the same denomination, the student can anticipate an additional six to ten requirements beyond the core courses. With only six to ten actual electives the student will tend to use them in courses specifically related to preparation for ministry.

#### Field Education

The field education program is an important part of the student's development as a ministering person. It is a field-based program which provides a different type of learning from that acquired in the classroom. Each student participating in the field education program works under the direction of a trained on-site supervisor and participates in a seminar using the action-reflection model. Each student must have two field education experiences and participate in two seminars. These are required for graduation but do not carry academic credit.

The field education program has five goals:

- (1) Developing and testing ministerial vocation
- (2) Developing ministerial identity
- (3) Developing basic skills for ministry
- (4) Interpreting specific acts of ministry theologically
- (5) Integrating theological perception with specific acts of ministry



Each year the Field Education Office offers approximately 200 settings in which students may work. Four-fifths are in local churches; the remaining one-fifth are in various institutional settings (mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, retirement, correctional, campus ministries and college teaching). While most students are placed in settings sponsored by the Field Education Office, they may, and do, apply to other approved settings. These must meet the specified requirements of the Field Education Office. Each assignment carries with it regular supervision by persons trained by the Field Education Office and requires a learning covenant and a final evaluation.

The first Field Education seminar focuses on the exploration and discovery of ministry and the individual's place in it. These seminars are led by Divinity School staff and local pastors. The second seminar focuses on the integration of theology and the practice of ministry. They are led by Divinity School faculty and the Assistant Dean for Field Education.

Field education placements under the auspices of the Field Education Office are funded through resources the office can establish, specifically The Duke Endowment, the Divinity School, and local churches. Such placements are developed on the basis of their merits as field learning sites. Students in field education placements provided by the Field Education Office count their income from their placement as part of their financial aid from the Divinity School. It should be understood, however, that field education assignments are pursued on their own merit and are only secondarily a financial aid resource. No student is assigned a field placement who does not apply for placement and agree to comply with the learning components.

A unique aspect of the field education program is the relationship with the Office of the Rural Church of The Duke Endowment. Grants from The Duke Endowment



enable students to be placed in rural United Methodist churches (defined as churches located in communities with a population of 1,500 or less) in North Carolina. This increases the range of churches and communities in which the student may gain experience.

#### Areas of Concern

Several concerns were raised relative to the curriculum. In regard to the four aims previously stated, it was the opinion that these aims needed to be expanded to include the moral and spiritual development of the students. It was also felt that some consideration needs to be given to setting priorities among the aims. It was also felt that courses, especially new courses, should be developed and reviewed in light of the curricular aims.

A second area of concern had to do with faculty control over the curriculum in general and over the programs of individual students. Specific aspects of this concern included:

- (1) The placement of students in courses including the advanced placement process and the advisor system. Oral tradition appears to be a major factor in the individual student program planning. The events of orientation week have major implications for the selection of electives by entering students. Direct faculty input occurs through the advisor system. However, superficial factors may all too frequently be determinative (i.e., the days of the week and the time of the day in which a course is scheduled). It would be more desirable to see the criteria for student course selection be more clearly and directly faced so that the selection of specific courses might more directly prepare the student for ministry rather than be based on extraneous factors. Student decisions concerning their academic program, as well as the development of courses, need to consider more seriously the nature of ministry in today's society, more seriously than the gifts, interests, and convenience of individual students and individual faculty members.



- (2) The process by which courses are established. In the period between major curriculum revisions, changes in courses and the adding/dropping of courses has largely been at the initiative of the individual instructor. It may be based on his or her interests which may or may not be informed by the aims of the curriculum. Only rarely are courses developed upon the initiative of the division or the invitation of the faculty. Faculty control over the adoption of courses is expressed, therefore, by individual faculty members, by divisions, and finally, by the Educational Affairs Council.
- (3) The sequence of courses and their interrelatedness within and across the various fields. Except for the required or core courses, the sequencing of courses is left to the decision of the individual. It is sometimes based on factors which have little to do with the interconnectedness of the different courses.
- (4) The lack of structures to ensure the integration of the parts of the student's theological education. The integration of the various parts of the student's theological education is left to the individual; there is not a structure which will ensure that this occurs responsibly and with accountability. It is, therefore, possible that the total may be less than the sum of the parts.

There is general agreement in the faculty that the curriculum is in need of reevaluation and revision in light of new needs, new opportunities, new faculty, and changed realities in theological education. At the 1982 Faculty Retreat it was agreed that such curricular revision should be a high priority for the Dean and faculty.





## IX

### CONTINUING EDUCATION

The Center for Continuing Education and Advanced Ministerial Studies at the Divinity School provides short-term, in-residence seminars and conferences for ministers and laypeople. In an effort to provide professional and educational development for various aspects of ministry, both in and beyond the local church, the Center for Continuing Education offers a variety of programs. These programs can be distinguished according to their objectives and their constituencies.

The majority of continuing education programs sponsored or co-sponsored by the Divinity School bring together ministers in small groups for a week of intensive study. Seminars on such topics as technology and ethics, Christian writing, arts in the church, and economics for clergy, draw participants from across the country and across denominational lines. District seminars provide opportunities for United Methodist ministers to join with others in their district for guided instruction in some aspect of ministry. Travel-study seminars, primarily to Mexico and China, have enabled participants to experience the significant contribution of World Christianity to the development of Christian life and thought.

Another important part of the program of the Center for Continuing Education is special programming such as pastors' schools, academic colloquys, and convocations. Over 700 ministers, alumni and friends of the Divinity School return to Duke for the annual Divinity School Convocation to hear two major



lecture series, the James A. Gray Lectures and the Franklin S. Hickman Lectures. In conjunction with these lectures continuing education classes are offered to enhance the total experience of the Convocation.

The Center for Continuing Education also provides occasions for independent study by ministers. The Independent Reading Week program allows a minister to come for a week of individual, in-residence study with full use of, and access to, Divinity School resources. The Benjamin N. Duke and Parish Ministry Fund Fellows programs allow for selected parish ministers to come to the Divinity School for a three-month, in-residence, study leave.

Although the primary constituency of the Center for Continuing Education consists of those persons who have completed the M.Div. degree, the extensive program which has developed is an integral part of the total program of theological education at Duke. The Center for Continuing Education is able to draw upon the rich resources of the Divinity School as well as Duke University. Major lectures, travel programs, and seminars that bring together M.Div. students and practicing ministers have become a part of the total academic program of the Divinity School.

The Director of Continuing Education supervises all non-degree educational programs of the Divinity School. The Director works closely with the church, other schools in the University, and The Duke Endowment. The exact nature of an appointment to this position is under consideration in light of administrative and curricular revisions. The commitment of the Divinity School is to maintain its national leadership in continuing theological education.



## STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND ENROLLMENT TRENDS

This section of the Report will present data on student characteristics and enrollment trends for the period 1970-1982. Included will be enrollment by degree candidacy, sex, race, and denomination.

The enrollment in the Divinity School has fluctuated during the twelve-year period. After a drop from 299 in 1970 to 245 in 1971, the total increased to a high of 382 in 1977. Since then the enrollment decreased slightly but has remained stable for the past four years.

The large majority of the students are in the M.Div. degree program. The increase in the enrollment has been in the candidates for the M.Div. degree. The number of M.R.E. candidates has remained stable over the past decade. The enrollment in the Th.M. program dropped by about one-half after the B.D. degree was changed to the M.Div. in 1971 but has remained stable since. The number of special students (non-degree candidates) and auditors has not changed in a decade. The enrollment trends by degree are shown in Table 9.

The number of students in the Graduate Division of Religion has remained fairly constant at about 50 for the period 1970-1982. The current total of 54 which includes 52 Ph.D. candidates and 2 M.A. candidates is the largest number in the past twelve years. These data are presented in Table 10. Only those graduate students in residence are included in these figures.

At Duke, as in many Protestant theological seminaries, the 1970's was a



Table 9  
Enrollment by Degree\*  
1970 - 1982

<u>Year</u>	<u>M.Div.</u>	<u>M.R.E.</u>	<u>Th.M.</u>	<u>Special and Auditors</u>	<u>Total</u>
1970	254	10	19	16	299
1971	225	6	7	7	245
1972	232	10	10	13	265
1973	270	8	9	12	299
1974	289	5	7	26	327
1975	321	3	10	12	346
1976	324	5	15	21	365
1977	328	8	9	37	382
1978	344	8	8	24	384
1979	335	8	8	23	374
1980	328	7	6	25	366
1981	316	5	7	35	63
1982	323	6	11	30	370

\*Fall Semester





Table 10  
 Graduate Division of Religion  
 1970 - 1982

<u>Year</u>	<u>M.A.</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>	<u>Total</u>
1970	3	51	54
1971	3	41	44
1972	2	47	49
1973	6	40	46
1974	3	40	43
1975	3	44	47
1976	5	45	50
1977	4	52	56
1978*	3	21	24
1979	1	49	50
1980	3	42	45
1981	0	51	51
1982	2	52	54

\*Includes only persons actually in residence



period in which the number of women students increased significantly. From 33 women, or 11% of the total enrollment in 1970, the number of women increased each year to 1977 when there were 123 or 31.7% of the total students. Since then the number of women students has leveled off, ranging between 26.2% and 29.9% of the total. In the current year there are 100 women students or 27%. The enrollment by sex is shown on Table 11.

The Divinity School has long had a substantial majority of its students affiliated with The United Methodist Church. The proportion of United Methodist students has tended to range between 60 and 75 percent. United Methodists currently represent 73.8% of the current student body, the highest proportion since 1970. The trend for an increasing number of students to attend seminaries of their own denomination appears to be fairly widespread and is reflected in the Divinity School.

During the past twelve years the proportion of United Methodist students has increased. This gain has been accompanied by a decrease in students affiliated with other denominations. However, this decrease has occurred in what might be considered mainline denominations, particularly Baptist, Presbyterian and Episcopal. Duke has tended to lose students affiliated with denominations with seminaries in this region.

Thirty non-United Methodist denominations are represented in the student body. However, two-fifths of this group are affiliated with five mainline denominations. The remaining students represent twenty-five different communions. The enrollment by denomination is shown on Table 12.

During the early years of the 1970's the number of black students increased from 10 to over 30. From 1975 to 1982 the total has ranged from



Table 11  
Enrollment by Sex\*  
1970 - 1982

<u>Year</u>	<u>Men</u>		<u>Women</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1970	266	89.0	33	11.0
1971	229	93.5	16	6.5
1972	231	87.2	34	12.8
1973	250	83.6	49	16.4
1974	247	75.5	80	24.5
1975	254	73.4	92	26.6
1976	265	72.7	100	27.3
1977	261	68.3	121	31.7
1978	269	70.1	115	29.9
1979	270	72.2	104	27.8
1980	270	73.7	96	26.2
1981	262	72.2	101	27.8
1982	270	73.0	100	27.0

\*Fall Semester



Table 12  
Enrollment by Denomination\*  
1970 - 1982

<u>Year</u>	<u>United Methodist</u>	<u>Baptist</u>	<u>Presby- terian</u>	<u>Epis- copal</u>	<u>UCC</u>	<u>Disciples of Christ</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
1970-71	217	27	13	6	12	3	21	299
1971-72	167	29	10	4	11	1	23	245
1972-73	177	33	5	7	13	4	26	265
1973-74	182	25	12	8	9	5	58	299
1974-75	196	21	21	16	9	3	61	327
1975-76	216	23	23	15	15	5	49	346
1976-77	220	23	28	11	14	7	62	365
1977-78	265	31	29	14	12	8	23	382
1978-79	272	35	23	11	11	8	24	384
1979-80	270	37	22	10	12	4	19	374
1980-81	261	29	13	9	11	5	38	366
1981-82	248	24	14	8	8	10	51	363
1982-83	273	18	13	9	9	4	44	370

\*Fall Semester





30 to 40. For each of the three most recent years, there have been 32. The number of Native American students has ranged from 0 to 3 while the total of foreign students has varied from 0 to 6. These data are shown in Table 13.



Table 13  
Enrollment by Race\*  
1970 - 1982

<u>Year</u>	<u>White American</u>	<u>Black American</u>	<u>Native American</u>	<u>Foreign</u>	<u>Total</u>
1970	284	10	0	5	299
1971	234	11	0	0	245
1972	252	11	0	6	
1973	271	21	0	7	299
1974	293	29	1	4	327
1975	307	34	1	4	346
1976	329	33	1	2	365
1977	345	35	1	1	382
1978	341	40	0	3	384
1979	338	30	2	4	374
1980	329	32	2	3	366
1981	323	32	3	5	363
1982	333	32	2	3	370

\*Fall Semester



## XI

### STUDENT SERVICES

This section will deal with student services provided by the Divinity School and the University. These include such services as financial aid, housing, health, the Women's Center and the Office of Black Church Affairs.

#### Services

The Divinity School maintains a financial assistance program to help students meet the costs of securing a theological education. While the primary responsibility for financing his or her education lies with the student, the School endeavors to assist persons of limited means and demonstrated need as far as resources permit. The guidelines set by the ATS are followed.

There are several sources of financial aid. These include field education assignments for which a stipend is provided, service as a student pastor, part-time employment on and off campus, scholarship and tuition grants and loans. Assistance is provided to enable the student to utilize these resources.

The student submits a budget and a listing of resources. This is received by the Financial Aid Committee who puts together a financial aid "package" which hopefully will enable the student to attend the Divinity School. The student who does not feel that the Committee's decision has been fair can appeal to a special committee. However, appeals are infrequent.

Approximately eighty students serve as student pastors in any given year. One-half of these are in churches close enough to Durham to enable them to



commute daily. The remainder stay in Durham during the week and spend the weekends at their church. Student pastors are required to take a reduced load so that four years is necessary to complete the M.Div. degree.

Married and single Divinity students are eligible for housing in Duke's Central Campus apartments. However, most students reside off campus in the Durham community. Graduating students tend to pass desirable housing along to other students. The School informally assists persons in finding places to live.

A variety of services are provided by the University. The Student Health Service is available to persons enrolled in the Divinity School, as is Duke's Counseling and Psychological Services.

A variety of cultural events held throughout the year are available to Divinity School students. They may also utilize the sports and recreational facilities (tennis, swimming, handball, etc.).

#### Women's Center

The Women's Center began operations in the Fall Semester, 1974. It was established to meet the needs for fellowship and support of the growing number of women students. The office has been coordinated by two students who share responsibility. The Center has been related to the Director of Admissions and Student Affairs.

The Women's Center has performed a support and an advocacy role for women students. The support role has been through a variety of fellowship activities, retreats, and the sponsorship of programs of interest to women. The advocacy function has involved bringing to the attention of the administration matters of concern to women. A monthly newsletter, the Sojourner, contributes to both functions. Specific accomplishments have included the preparation of a hymn book





with inclusive language, the preparation of inclusive language guidelines which were adopted by the faculty, the organization of support groups for specific categories of people such as second-career women and clergy couples and helping to develop continuing education programs and courses of interest to women.

The coordinators of the Women's Center have been students. This has had both disadvantages and advantages. The major disadvantage is that it limits the time which can be given to the program of the Center. However, having this program under the direction of students ensures that the issues which are addressed are those which are of greatest concern to the students at that particular time. Given the rate of change in the church, this is a significant factor.

#### The Office of Black Church Affairs

The Office of Black Church Affairs was established in 1972. It has had a full-time director who was a member of the staff but not of the faculty. The office is now in a period of transition between the administration of Dr. Lawrence E. Johnson who left at the end of the Spring Semester, 1982 and Dr. Grant S. Shockley who will begin the Fall Semester, 1983. The new arrangement will be different in that Dr. Shockley will also be a member of the faculty as Professor of Christian Education.

The Office of Black Church Affairs has served as a liaison between the black students and the rest of the School. It has contributed to providing a support system for black students and to keeping their needs and concerns before the larger community. The Director has worked closely with other faculty and staff on such matters as recruitment, field education placement, financial aid and academic advising. The specific directions in the future will, to a large degree, be dependent on the person now responsible for the office.



## XII

### PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The Divinity School facilities consist of two adjoining buildings. The old building was part of the original campus and contains classrooms, offices, York Chapel, the Library and a Cokesbury Bookstore. The Department of Religion and the Director of Graduate Studies in Religion are housed in this building. The building was completely renovated and airconditioned in the 1960's.

The new Divinity School building was completed in January 1973. It consists of offices, conference rooms, classrooms, media center, student lounge and the Alumni Memorial Common Room, a large well-appointed room for special meetings and receptions. Because the Divinity School is part of Duke University, students have access to a wide range of University facilities. Thus the Divinity School does not have to provide housing, food service or recreational facilities.

Overall, the Divinity School facilities are excellent. There are three major needs. The first is for a large lecture room for occasional large classes and, more importantly, for visiting speakers and meetings of professional societies. The largest classrooms, which have a seating capacity of ninety-six and sixty-seven, are not suitable for lectures or special meetings.

The second need is an adequate setting for worship. When the new building was projected in the late 1960's, it was to have included both a chapel and a lecture hall. In anticipation of this, York Chapel was converted into a library reading room and shelves were installed. When financial stringencies caused the new chapel and lecture hall to be canceled, the reading room was turned back into



a chapel. The book shelves remain. York Chapel continues to be the place where the Divinity School gathers for worship. It is too small to seat the number of persons who regularly attend worship. As a worship setting it leaves much to be desired. It is totally inadequate for meetings of the student body and for Divinity School Opening and Closing Convocations.

The third need is for renovation of the first floor (basement) of the old building. The first floor offices, post office area, and rooms used for student services need rethinking and refurbishing. There is much space which is not now being used effectively. More satisfactory faculty office space, better Bookstore facilities, and more adequate provision for technical services are needed.



XIII  
ALUMNI

The Divinity School has approximately 3,000 living alumni. Almost three-fourths of these reside in the southeastern part of the United States. Table 14 shows the current residences of the graduates by region or United Methodist Jurisdiction. There are 73.3% living in the southeast and 11.2% in the northeast. Graduates outside the United States account for 1.7% of the total.

Graduates of the Divinity School live in forty-six states. Two-fifths (39.8%) are in North Carolina. The second two largest groups are in the adjacent states, Virginia (9.2%) and South Carolina (5.7%). The next largest numbers are in Florida (5.7%) and Texas (3.6%). These data are shown on Table 15.

A brief questionnaire was mailed to an 8% sample of alumni. Usable returns were received from ninety-three persons (32.4%). Included in this group were representatives of forty classes from 1932 to 1981. There were 87.1% men and 12.9% women. There were 83.8% who had received an M.Div. from Duke, 6.5% a Th.M., 6.5% a Ph.D. and 2.2% an M.R.E. Blacks constituted 5.4% and other minorities 4.3%. There were 94.6% who were ordained. Almost three-fourths (72.0%) were United Methodists.

There were 48.4% of the respondents who were pastors of local churches and 4.3% who were members of church staffs. Professors made up 5.4%; 16.1% were retired. The remaining persons held a variety of church and non-church positions.





Table 14  
 Alumni by Region\*  
 1982

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Northeast	321	11.2
Southeast	2,106	73.3
North Central	216	7.5
South Central	90	3.1
Western	92	3.2
Other	<u>50</u>	<u>1.7</u>
Total	2,875	100.00

\*United Methodist Jurisdictions



Table 15  
 Alumni by State  
 1982

<u>State</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
North Carolina	1,143	39.8	Iowa	17	0.6
Virginia	265	9.2	Colorado	15	0.5
South Carolina	164	5.7	District of Columbia	12	0.4
Florida	124	4.3	New Mexico	12	0.4
Texas	103	3.6	Connecticut	11	0.4
Tennessee	86	3.0	Kansas	11	0.4
Georgia	64	2.2	Washington	9	0.3
Pennsylvania	63	2.2	Delaware	7	0.2
Ohio	62	2.2	Oregon	6	0.2
West Virginia	62	2.2	Wisconsin	6	0.2
Maryland	58	2.0	Arizona	4	0.1
New York	57	1.9	Idaho	4	0.1
Alabama	55	1.9	Nebraska	4	0.1
California	50	1.7	Maine	3	0.1
Kentucky	48	1.7	New Hampshire	2	0.1
Illinois	41	1.5	Nevada	2	0.1
Michigan	29	1.0	Rhode Island	2	0.1
Mississippi	29	1.0	Utah	2	0.1
Missouri	28	1.0	Vermont	2	0.1
Arkansas	26	0.9	North Dakota	1	0.05
Indiana	26	0.9	South Dakota	1	0.05
Louisiana	25	0.9	Alaska	0	0.00
Oklahoma	24	0.8	Hawaii	0	0.00
New Jersey	23	0.8	Montana	0	0.00
Massachusetts	19	0.7	Wyoming	0	0.00
Minnesota	18	0.6	Other	50	1.7
				<u>2,875</u>	<u>100.00</u>



The alumni were asked about their contact with the School during the past five years. Almost two-thirds (62.4%) had visited the campus and 40.9% had attended the Convocation and Pastors' School. There were 29.0% who had attended a continuing education event on campus and 18.3% who had attended a Duke-sponsored continuing education event away from the campus. A field education student has been in the churches of 17.2%. Only 8.6% reported no contact with the Divinity School during the past five years.

When asked to describe the frequency of their contact with the Divinity School, 16.1% said it had been frequent or very frequent. There were 31.2% who described their contact as occasional and 34.4% as infrequent.

When asked if they had ever recommended the Divinity School to a prospective student, 83.9% replied that they had done so. When asked if they would now recommend the Divinity School to a prospective student, only one person said he would not do so.

The questionnaire contained several open-ended questions dealing with the respondent's perception of the adequacy of his/her seminary education, the strengths and weaknesses of the Divinity School and what they would like to see the School doing today. When interpreting the answers to these questions, it must be remembered that the respondents represent fifty years of Divinity School graduates.

A wide range of topics were included among the written answers. The vast majority of persons reported that their education at Duke had adequately prepared them for their subsequent careers. Some typical comments were:

"Duke Divinity School adequately prepared me for the work of ministry. The finest way to describe this is to say I was introduced to the wide spectrum of the ministry of the church."



"It has stood me in good stead. I received a solid theological and biblical base. My strong interest in the mission of the church was formulated at Duke."

"Excellent. I have never outrun the resources of that education."

A number of persons stated that their preparation in the practical fields was not as strong as in the academic disciplines. One man commented, "My preparation in church administration was inadequate but that is because I did not take any courses in that subject." Several respondents strongly urged that the Divinity School maintain a high level of excellence in all areas, including the practical subjects. One wrote, "Keep your standards high and don't relax them to attract more students."

An area of interest to a significant number of persons is a professional doctorate. These persons said that they would like to see the Divinity School offer such a degree. Suggestions included the D.Min., S.T.D., and Th.D.

There were many specific suggestions such as "recruit more students from South Carolina." However, the overwhelming impression one receives from reading these questionnaires is that this group of alumni are highly appreciative of their experience at Duke and supportive of the School. One person who graduated over forty years ago wrote:

"I am grateful for the opportunity and privileges that my years at Duke afforded. As the years accumulate I am increasingly aware of how significant those three years were and are."





#### XIV

#### CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

After the first thirteen sections of the Divinity School Self-Study Report were completed, the faculty met twice to draw conclusions and consider implications. Meeting both in sub-committees and as a committee-of-the-whole, the faculty reached the following conclusions about directions for progress:

(1) Curriculum. The Divinity School needs to examine its curriculum. This examination should include careful analysis of the current state of the educational program, study and evaluation of theological curricula at other schools, reflection on philosophical and theological issues in ministerial education, and development of a comprehensive proposal to the faculty concerning the education for ministry at Duke.

Several matters were identified by the faculty for attention. These include:

- a. problems related to teaching and administration of courses required of all students;
- b. problems concerning advanced standing;
- c. the place of University courses offered outside the Divinity School in the theological course of study;
- d. whether the curriculum should define a sequential patterning of courses;
- e. the place of field-based learning in the curriculum;
- f. problems with academic advising.



The self-study process raised questions for the faculty about the possibility of instituting one or more additional degree programs. The Divinity School faculty is strong in quality and number. The M.Div. enrollment has remained stable and selective but is not likely to grow. The faculty agreed that emphasis should be given to the M.R.E. degree, especially since an addition to the faculty was made in the discipline of Christian Education and there is continued availability of jobs in the field. Duke should have a larger enrollment in its M.R.E. program.

The Duke Th.M. program needs attention. Its place in the total curriculum should be examined.

Exploration should be given to the possibility of the establishment of a Master of Theological Studies or Master of Arts in Religion degree which would be designed for persons who wish to pursue advanced study in a professional school of theology but who do not wish to, or cannot, enroll in the M.Div. program. Provision should be made for persons who wish to work part-time on the M.T.S. degree. Such a program would allow persons who are older and who are employed full-time to enroll in a degree program in the Divinity School. Currently the Divinity School largely excludes persons who cannot be full-time residential students. A small, select M.T.S. or M.A.R. program might enhance the student body and provide some additional enrollment by tapping a new group of potential students.

The Graduate Executive Council, composed of the Dean of the Divinity School, the Chairman of the Department of Religion, the Director of Graduate Studies and three members of the Divinity School faculty and three members of the Department of Religion faculty, has recently decided to reduce the number



of students in the Ph.D. program. The reasons for this include the desire to admit only the finest students, to increase financial aid packages for this select group, and to reduce the work load of some departments, notably New Testament and Church History, the two most heavily enrolled fields.

The Divinity School will explore the possibility of instituting a Doctor of Theology (Th.D.) degree in the Divinity School. This degree would be in several disciplines of professional ministry which are not included in the Ph.D. curriculum, such as liturgics, homiletics, Christian education, pastoral care, and church and society. Such a program would be small and select. Preliminary research suggests that there is need in American theological education for such a program to prepare persons to teach in practical theology in theological schools and that Duke would be an appropriate setting for such a program. The Th.D. degree would be a program of the Divinity School and would result in an addition to the enrollment of the School. (The Ph.D. program is a program of the Divinity School, along with the Department of Religion, and Divinity faculty carry most of the dissertation advising, but students are enrolled in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.) A Th.D. program might enhance the work of the Divinity School both through the addition of a group of highly qualified students whose commitment is to advanced work in practical theology and through service rendered to the church and theological education. There are few places in the United States now equipped to offer doctoral work in the disciplines of practical theology.

The faculty established a Curriculum Committee to work on its behalf on all of these matters. The Committee began its work in the Fall of 1983.



(2) Faculty Development. In the course of the self-study, the faculty gave attention to the fact that numerous additions to its ranks would need to be made due to immediate needs and impending retirements.

In order that such needs could be met effectively, efficiently and collegially, a Committee on Faculty Planning and Appointment was created. This Committee, with broad representation from across all ranks and fields, advises the faculty in faculty planning and appointment.

The faculty established the following priorities: New Testament, Worship, Christian Education, Historical Theology, Wesley Studies, American Christianity, Old Testament. It was further agreed that the addition of women and ethnic minority persons should be a high priority. In order to achieve the addition of women and ethnic minority faculty, the Committee was charged to explore highly-qualified women and ethnic minority candidates in imaginative ways and without rigid adherence to a preconceived job description.

The Self-Study Report demonstrates that Duke needs to be sensitive to a number of variables in faculty development: field, rank, racial and sexual inclusiveness, Ph.D. granting institution, denomination, and age. In all cases concern for scholarly excellence, potential for continuing productivity, teaching ability, and commitment to theological education for Christian ministry will be requisite.

(3) Administration. The Self-Study demonstrates the need for some administrative reorganization. Several faculty sub-committees took note of the fact that expanded responsibilities have made the deanship increasingly demanding. With the University shifting the burden of alumni affairs, development, communications, and personnel administration to its constituent schools, the administration of the Divinity School is becoming more complex.





A committee of the Divinity School Board of Visitors tackled this problem and made some helpful observations and recommendations about organization and management. Both the faculty and the Board of Visitors suggest the exploration of a full-time Associate Dean and some reorganization of administrative functions.

(4) Admissions and Financial Aid. Duke must be attentive to trends in theological school enrollments in order to maintain its present enrollment with no reduction of standards for admission. The M.R.E. program should enroll more students. Additional degree programs, such as the M.T.S. and Th.D. would provide a small additional group of quality students without altering the proper preeminence of the basic professional degree program (M.Div.). Concerted efforts need to be made to continue to enlarge the geographical spread of students in the School.

Attention must be given to financial aid policies, particularly in light of the fact that some theological schools are offering no-need scholarship programs. The relationship between financial aid and enrollment is complex, and no immediate alteration of Duke policies may be requisite; but the question of no-need scholarships should be explored.

(5) Physical Facilities. While Divinity School physical facilities are good, there are several needs which emerged in the Self-Study. The School needs a large lecture room. Eventually the Library will need more space. The ground floor of the Old Building needs renovation. York Chapel is inadequate. In the long-run the Library will need York Chapel since there is no other space for Library expansion. The Divinity School needs to consider its needs for the future. It may be wise to think about new construction for a chapel and lecture room, renovation of the ground floor of Gray Building, and the use of York Chapel for Library expansion.



(6) Communications. The self-study process demonstrated that the Divinity School needs to make communications a high priority. The addition of a Director of Communications is significant. He will reorganize publications, press relations, and all aspects of the Divinity School's efforts to relate to its constituencies and the general public. The point is not to create an image, but to "tell the story" of Duke Divinity School. Communications includes a strong concern for attention to church relationships and the relationship of theological education to the day-to-day work of the local church.

(7) Financial Development. A major capital campaign will need to be planned looking toward a beginning date approximately two to three years from now. Duke University is currently engaged in a campaign for the Arts and Sciences to raise approximately \$160 million for endowment. The Divinity School will have to wait until the Arts and Sciences campaign is concluded to inaugurate its effort. The campaign should focus on endowment but include money for needed physical facilities.

The future of the Divinity School will depend on effective work in financial development.



THE STUDENT SELF-STUDY REPORT



## PREFACE

The student body of Duke Divinity School met on two separate occasions, January 20 and 27, 1982 in an open forum to prepare the initial phase of this Self-Study Report. The compilers of this Report met on several occasions in the Fall Semester 1982 to refine and sharpen this Report for final presentation. Subsequently, the current document has been recently re-edited to make it congruent with changes which have occurred and are occurring within the Divinity School. Throughout this process, the Student Representative Assembly attempted to include not only student leaders, but students not in leadership positions, women, blacks, student pastors, and persons from each class were invited and urged to attend. Therefore, our Report reflects a variety of concerns, affirmations, and suggestions. It must be kept in mind that while we have attempted to stress the various points of agreement, this Report reflects the diverse and pluralistic nature that we possess as a student body. This, then, is not a consensus report.

Our Report is a conscious effort to reflect our concerns and affirmations about the Divinity School. However, we were unable to meet with the regularity and intensity that would have been more desirable and profitable. Therefore, we submit this Report with the understanding that the points raised are a part of our continual self-analysis.

Finally, we recognize our limitations as students in certain areas, especially those areas such as Governance and Degree Programs. We acknowledge





that we may not always know what forms and structures may best meet our needs and that there are areas in which we have little knowledge. Still, we are deeply interested in this School and feel the need to respond and be informed of its happenings and policies. We have an investment here at Duke Divinity School and in that sense, it is, and always will be, ours. We look forward to participating in all efforts to enhance the traditions, realities, and possibilities of Duke Divinity School.



## THE STUDENT SELF-STUDY REPORT

### Degree Programs

Participants in the ATS forums, while expressing concern about degree inflation, voiced a greater interest in investigating the possible addition of a Doctor of Theology or Doctor of Sacred Theology program. There was sentiment that an S.T.D. or Th.D. program would allow for an academically credible advanced degree which would also necessitate the expansion of the disciplines of worship, preaching, and Christian Education. Further, an S.T.D. and/or Th.D. program would provide a broader professional background for ministry. However, it was felt that prior to the addition of further degree programs, the Master of Divinity program must be re-examined in order to insure that it merits the highest professional and academic standards, as well as insuring a relevancy to the needs of the parish (our primary constituency).

Discussion concerning shapes of current degree programs focused solely on the M.Div. program. In light of the need to advance the sharpness and quality of the M.Div. program, we discourage the pyramiding of core courses while simultaneously encouraging the faculty to guide students in the exploration of specific and emerging concerns. We would encourage the investigation of a full-time ministerial internship, to be added to current degree requirements. Any such program must take into account the diverse needs, backgrounds, and goals of seminarians. Flexibility must be a prime element in such a program addition. The internship would have as its goal the integration of the academic life of the student with the practical life of the parish.



Participants expressed a need to re-evaluate the system of advanced placement for core courses in order to insure uniformity in method and to clarify the extent of advanced placement. A suggestion was offered that a good method of insuring uniformity of placement credit would be a system of testing immediately prior to the first semester of enrollment.

If the M.Div. program is to take full advantage of the relationship between the Graduate School of Religion and the Divinity School, that relationship must be re-examined and re-evaluated. Concerns articulated were: that the aims of the School of Religion take precedence over the aims of the Divinity School to the detriment of the Master of Divinity program and that the use of Divinity School funds to subsidize instruction in the School of Religion is unmet.

#### Curriculum

The present curriculum has several strengths and weaknesses. We feel positively about the weighting of the curriculum towards the historical viewpoint and tradition of the church. The Divinity School provides an excellent rounding in the classical disciplines. Biblical studies are perceived to be superior. The only criticism of that discipline is its limited course offering.

During the student body forums in the spring of 1982, a strong sentiment was expressed that to offer only one section of a core course to a student body of this size was simply unacceptable and a clear indication of poor advanced planning. We are happy to note a year and a half later that the administration and faculty have taken measures to address and remedy this situation. Greater attention should continue to be given to the needs of students in regard to class times. Preliminary consideration should be given



to maximize student options through flexible scheduling. Specifically, core courses should not be offered at the same time as choice electives.

The Divinity School also needs to place greater emphasis on its ministerial division. Classes in the division often suffer from a "stigma" and efforts must be made to make them more academically credible. A greater emphasis on the ministerial division should lead the Divinity School to strive actively to increase both the faculty and course offerings in this area.

The implementation of mandatory course evaluations is much desired by students. Such evaluations would be of use to both students and faculty. Further, we strongly recommend that course evaluations be conducted prior to the final examination period to allow students time to respond in a proper, thorough, and thoughtful fashion.

"Methodist studies need help." The courses and lectures need to be infused with more energy and creativity. The Methodism class, to its credit, is beginning to use outside instructors and guest lecturers (e.g., Bishop Kenneth Goodson and Dean Dennis Campbell).

A faculty person should be hired whose speciality and sole responsibility would be the area of Methodist studies. A Divinity School of United Methodist orientation and affiliation, which prides itself on academic excellence should provide its students with courses in Methodist studies commensurate with this excellence.

Students are generally pleased with preceptors. However, professors owe it to students to monitor both lecture content and grading of the preceptors. In a similar vein, meaningful discussion is hampered by the large numbers in some preceptorials. We also suggest that if classes are going to overflow in numbers, more preceptors be hired to facilitate discussion.





Specific concern needs to be directed to the relevance of ministerial courses to the needs of black students. Heightened sensitivity should be developed toward black preaching and tradition. A similar concern is that the ministerial courses are more directed toward the needs of First Church, Anytown, rather than the predominate type of pastoral charge. Several suggestions are offered. First, a greater integration of black preaching and tradition and style in PR 30. Second, we note the increased number of courses dealing with the current theological issues. We hope that this will continue. Finally, the suggestion has been made that we expand American Christianity to a two-semester sequence. This course would need to include a fully developed study of the black Christian church, feminist issues, as well as other vital areas of concern. Within this schema, a separate black church course would still be offered to those who wish. However, with the removal of artificial distinctions the requirement to take a separate black church course would be removed.

Most students expressed overall satisfaction with the current Field Education program, specifically its financial aid benefits and opportunities for practical engagement in ministry. While we affirm the ministry of Maurice Ritchie to students, we must note that the black constituency of the Divinity School expressed concern and dissatisfaction with the insensitivity of the Field Education Office to the needs of blacks.

It was felt that entering students could better understand the program, including settings which are acceptable for credit and Field Education graduation requirements, through a more explicit explanation in the Bulletin. Detailed Field Education policies need to be in written form, possibly in a handbook format. The handbook should be made available to all students and supervisors and should include guidelines eliminating such problems as the



hazy and frequently inequitable method for calculating the minimum number of hours to be spent in settings.

The Field Education Office should encourage individual initiative in securing Field Education settings. Further, the office needs to express a greater willingness to offer alternate Field Education assignments. The need for a sufficient amount of time off is viewed as important. Particular consideration should be given to students from distant locales. In addition, a system of full year assignments could enhance the ministerial experience and alleviate the feeling of some that students are "just playing church."

The structure of Field Education seminars needs to be carefully defined and standardized. The inequitable requirement for student pastors to take two semesters of the FE I seminar in isolation from other students tends to widen the already unhealthy gap between student pastors and other students and, ultimately, is not beneficial to the growth of community.

Students expressed a need for an institutionalized appeals structure for unsatisfactory Field Education assignments.

### Faculty

The student body expects the maintenance of the academic excellence associated with Duke University and the Divinity School. We urge the continued active recruitment of women and ethnic minorities as faculty. Our concern about the continual academic excellence of the Divinity School leads us to question the propriety of (a) excessive retention of Duke-educated persons in faculty positions, and (b) persons in full-instructional roles who do not hold definitive degrees.



Satisfaction was expressed with the quality of instruction. However, certain matters need to be addressed. First, increased student/faculty interaction in extra-classroom settings is desired. Such interaction will broaden the educative process beyond narrow academic confines. Second, faculty members have given the impression that they are disinterested in being a part of a total community. Students see all faculty members as an integral part of our community. Third, faculty members often imply, either consciously or unconsciously, that M.Div. students are something less than participants in a graduate program. While we affirm that the M.Div. is, in most regards a professional degree, we suspect that the aforementioned assumption at times leads faculty to require less of us, and we, as a result, require less of ourselves.

We must also express our concern regarding intra-faculty relationships. We believe that the Divinity School could only benefit from (a) increased communication between and among faculty, (b) evidences of mutual respect, (c) a demonstrated regard for creative approaches to instruction, and (d) the development and articulation of a professional ethic and standard of conduct.

We wish to affirm and celebrate the outstanding quality and extent of faculty research. We believe that these evidences of academic inquiry can only enhance our education and the reputation of the Divinity School. At the same time, we are anxious that publication not supplant teaching as the primary consideration for recruitment, retention, and promotion of faculty. As regards lectures, there is a need for lecture material to transcend published work. Students are capable of reading faculty publications and the repetition of material in class is superfluous. An adjunct to this concern involves the failure of some faculty to update lecture material.



In terms of the faculty's responsibility for our professional and ministerial development, we feel that a more integrated and systematic advising process is desirable. While we object to an artificial and imposed "trust" relationship, we do believe strongly that the advising process holds tremendous potential if based upon the mutual respect and interest of the students and faculty members involved. Relatedly, we believe that students should have one advisor during his/her entire stay at Duke Divinity School. Finally, the advising process should cover as many aspects of our professional and educational needs as possible, concentrating, naturally, on the styles of instruction, collateral course offerings, as well as student community life.

We wish to end this section of our report with a word of appreciation for the efforts and contributions of Bishop Kenneth Goodson. Bishop Goodson has added a special dimension to this Divinity School. His pastoral concern for us, indeed his very presence, has added not only to our education but has enriched our lives.

#### Student Body

We affirm the richness inherent in the diversity of the student body. We believe that a pluralistic school is a stronger school. Consequently the processes of measuring professional competence are as diverse as the individuals involved. A particular result of this situation is a need for a clearly articulated position regarding those who are seeking the Master of Divinity degree, but not ordination. A call to ministry is difficult to evaluate; therefore, we fear an overly standardized set of criteria to evaluate something as vital and changing as this. Further, we wish the faculty and administration





to remain sensitive to the responsibility inherent in the appropriate judicatories to judge the preparedness of those students who come under their care. Until such time as this issue may be addressed fully we suggest a retention of traditional measurement criteria. In this instance also there have been suggestions that the Divinity School provide for a complete pass/fail option.

We need to accept and prepare for students who have an increasingly diverse set of goals. Duke Divinity School will be doing a disservice to itself and its students if it continues to cast all into the mold of parish ministry or, indeed, any form of ordained ministry. Not only must we accept and prepare for students with divergent goals, we must also accept, prepare for, and actively recruit students of different backgrounds. Duke Divinity School is perhaps the most homogenous division within Duke University, thereby limiting educational opportunities. Heterogeneity enhances education and, therefore, we strongly urge the active recruitment of students from diverse ethnic, geographical, and socio-religious backgrounds. Such recruitment will be better enabled by the separation of the responsibilities of the Director of Admissions and the Director of Student Affairs.

Two other needs surfaced during this discussion. First, semester breaks are physical, emotional, and psychological necessities. Second, a request was made to consider the establishment of the position of a full-time Divinity School chaplain.

We believe that effective participation by students at all areas and aspects of Divinity School governance is essential. We must eschew tokenism and fully involve the student body through panel discussion, committee assignments and input from all student organizations.



### Governance

We request codification and presentation of Divinity School policies covering issues such as grading, pass/fail options, advance placement and the granting of extensions and incompletes. As these policies determine much of our lives within the Divinity School, we believe it only just that policies be articulated in a coherent manner. At present, the Divinity School has no judicial board. It is certainly troubling that students, as well as faculty, have no official recourse for the handling of grievances. Over the last several years, it has become obvious that a judicial board is essential to the just handling of grievances. The undergraduate school and all other graduate schools have a judicial body. Thus we feel that strong consideration should be given to the establishment of a Divinity School Judicial Board.

Throughout this document we have urged flexibility and the need to address individual concerns within the Divinity School. In a similar vein, we urge the University to recognize the uniqueness of the Divinity School and to adopt a position of flexibility regarding University-wide policies. Specifically, we wish the Duke University administration to be sensitized to the fact that a disproportionate number of students commute excessive distances. This, of necessity, requires special consideration in numerous areas (e.g., snow policy). Further, while the M.Div. is a professional degree, few, if any, of our graduates can ever expect remuneration commensurate with those of other professions (i.e., medicine, law). Consequently, tuition increases and all other fees should be proportionate to the relatively meager anticipated income. We ask that the University simply be aware of our distinctive situation.

This report was begun during the tenure of Dean S. Jameson Jones and



reflected our affirmations and concerns of his stewardship of the Divinity School. Especially, we noted his vision for the School, a vision which we shared and which included the recruitment of women and ethnic minority faculty, a strong relationship with our United Methodist connection, and a strong ministerial division in specific and a strong academic, yet practical, education in general.

Dennis M. Campbell entered the office of Dean of Duke Divinity School following the untimely death of Dean Jones. To date, Dean Campbell has moved swiftly to make both his and the community's vision a reality. In conjunction with the School's faculty, Dean Campbell's tenure has seen the addition to our faculty of both Dr. Grant S. Shockley and the Reverend Mary McClintock Fulkerson. The School has strengthened its connection with Methodism with the addition of Dr. Geoffrey Wainwright. The hiring of Dr. Richard Eslinger gives a new and strengthened dimension to the ministerial studies division. Each of these individuals will only further enhance the excellence of theological education at Duke Divinity School.

Dean Campbell has made a positive contribution to the Divinity School community through his interaction with students. He and his family have attended several student activities. The Dean is in regular attendance at chapel and the community coffee break. The "open door" policy of Dean Campbell provides students an increased access to the administration, thereby ensuring that we will at least be heard.

In conclusion, we celebrate both Dean Campbell's special vision for, and ministry to, this community. We look forward to the fullest development of both his vision and ministry in this setting.



Characteristics of the  
Divinity School Student Body  
Fall Semester 1983

In the fall semester 1983, a total of 364 persons are enrolled in the Divinity School. These include: M.Div. 325 (89.3 percent), M.R.E. 7 (1.9 percent), Th.M. 12 (3.3 percent) and special students 20 (5.5 percent). In addition, 15 persons are auditing courses. Twenty-three students are on leave of absence. Persons beginning their work at the Divinity School number 125 (34.3 percent).

The student body contains 248 (68.1 percent) men and 116 (31.9 percent) women. Included are 32 (8.8 percent) blacks, two (0.5 percent) native Americans and three (0.8 percent) foreign students.

The students come from 32 states, the District of Columbia and three foreign countries. The largest group, 178 (48.9 percent) is from North Carolina. This is followed by Virginia with 31 (8.5 percent) and Tennessee with 13 (3.6 percent). The number of students from each of the remaining states and the District of Columbia ranges from one to eight.

Twenty-seven (7.4 percent) students come from nine states west of the Mississippi River. Thirty (8.2 percent) come from the northeastern section of the country. Nineteen (5.2 percent) come from the midwestern states east of the Mississippi River.

Twenty-one denominations are represented by the students. United Methodists account for almost three-fourths (268 or 73.6 percent) of the persons enrolled. This is followed by Presbyterian (17 or 4.7 percent), Episcopal (11 or 3.0 percent), and Southern Baptist 9 (2.5 percent). Seven (1.9 percent) students are not affiliated with any denomination. Thirty-seven





(50.7 percent) of the 73 United Methodist Annual Conferences are represented in the current student body.

The Divinity School with almost half of its students from North Carolina has deep roots in the region in which it is located. However, it also has a nationwide constituency with students from 31 other states and the District of Columbia. The Divinity School's primary constituency is the United Methodist Church which provides approximately three-fourths of the current enrollment. It also has an ecumenical constituency represented by the 20 denominations with which the other one-fourth of the students are affiliated.

Robert L. Wilson  
Associate Dean for Curricular Affairs

October 10, 1983



Duke University Libraries



D02600994U





D02600994U

Duke University Libraries